RECEIVED OCT 1 3 1967

1968 PEACE CALENDAR

Modern American peace poetry will be the feature of the 1968 Peace Calendar. Denise Levertov has compiled the selection.

The price is $1.50 apiece, $7 for 5—postpaid. Gift cards will be inserted upon request. ORDER NOW!

STEADY GROWTH OF WRL IN WEST

by Bob Meriwether

The newly formed western regional office of WRL has been in operation now for three months at 514 Mission Street, San Francisco, California 94105, telephone (415) 391-2868. During this time an enormous quantity of literature, advice, and work has gone out from the office. We have now in quantity a number of tax refusal, draft resistance, and anti-war leaflets and pamphlets. In addition to Los Angeles WRL, 1046 North Sweetzer, Los Angeles, California 90069, telephone (213) OL 4-4491, we have local groups in Monterey, at 365 Spruce, Pacific Grove, California 93950, telephone (408) 375-7750; and in Portland, at 52 N.W. Macleay, Portland, Oregon 97210, telephone (503) 222-4642.

There is a constant stream of draft inquiries, by young men in high school or college, presently facing the draft or not, and especially there has been a noticeable increase in the number of soldiers and sailors themselves wishing to be released from the military. We work in close co-operation with CCCO, whose office we share, and pool our counseling efforts. In general, WRL is more closely associated with the noncooperation or Resistance position than with conscientious objection as such. WRL counselors, nevertheless, exercise the same strict impartiality that is expected of CCCO draft counselors. Dave Harris, our Regional Secretary, is a leading figure in the Resistance and has sparked the formation of many local Resistance groups throughout the west.

The telephone tax campaign is growing, with over 400 people now refusing in northern California. Probably, across the country thousands are by now engaged in this practical, significant form of civil disobedience.

REMINDER

OCTOBER 21 is the date for the next massive demonstration against the Vietnam war. *WASHINGTON, D.C.*, is the place. *NATIONAL MOBILIZATION*, successor to Spring Mobilization, is the sponsor.

SEPTEMBER
OCTOBER
1967

WRL NEWS

252

Published by the War Resisters League, 5 Beekman Street, New York 10038, N.Y., U.S. branch of the War Resisters International, a pacifist organization with affiliates in 53 countries. Ralph Di Gia, Administrative Secretary; David McReynolds, Field Secretary; Jim Peck, Editor. *No. 145*

October 16 — From Dissent to Resistance

The current wave of direct, open draft resistance began, historically, when David Miller burned his draft card on October 15, 1965. That was the spark that led, finally, to the mass draft card burning on April 15 of this year when 175 men publicly destroyed their draft cards in Central Park, New York City. What had begun as an individual act of resistance became a political fact, an effective and relevant movement. The current "Resistance" movement comes directly out of the April 15 draft card burning.

(Continued on page 2)

CAMPUS SPEAKING TOUR

Joseph Kearns, newly appointed WRL youth secretary, will make a campus speaking tour along the east coast this fall. Booking requests should be sent to the WRL office as soon as possible.

Also, students who want to get on the WRL special campus list should notify Kearns at the League office.

NEW LITERATURE

VIETNAM by Mary McCarthy (paperback). Perhaps the most outspoken indictment yet of U.S. policy $1.95*
IN PLACE OF WAR, an inquiry into nonviolent national defense, compiled by AFSC (paperback) $1.45
ESCALATION: A POLICY OF FAILURE, an AFSC pamphlet 25c

*Since this is the same price as THE ARROGANCE OF POWER by Senator Fullbright, which unfortunately is out of print though listed on our special Vietnam literature list (the yellow sheet sent out with the last issue), some persons may want to order it in substitution.

Those who received notice that VIETNAM: THE DIRTY WAR, the 25c pamphlet incorporating the *Le Monde* articles was out of print will be pleased to know that PEACE NEWS has reversed itself and decided to reprint it. We expect our new shipment from London shortly.

HANDBOOK SUPPLEMENT ON NEW DRAFT LAW, including the complete text of the new law and regulations with an analysis of the changes and complete text of basic Selective Service forms ..... $10—order from National Lawyers Guild, 1715 Francisco St., Berkeley, Calif. 94701

DRAFT RESISTANCE RECORD

HELL NO! I AIN'T GOING TO GO on one side; SUPER SAM on the other, done in folk rock style by Matt Jones, one of the original Freedom Singers—45 R.P.M. $1

ENROLLMENT BLANK

Send to War Resisters League
5 Beekman Street, New York 38, N. Y.

WAR IS A CRIME AGAINST HUMANITY.
I THEREFORE AM DETERMINED NOT TO SUPPORT ANY KIND OF WAR, INTERNATIONAL OR CIVIL, AND TO STRIVE FOR THE REMOVAL OF ALL THE CAUSES OR WAR.

signature

address

city *state*

occupation *age*

RESISTANCE *(Continued)*

Already the resistance movement (referred to simply as The Resistance by those taking part in it) has given new energy to the intellectual and academic community, driving it beyond the usual ads and public statements about opposition to the war. Support is now forming around these young men in much the same way support formed in France around those French youth who risked their careers and their freedom to oppose the Algerian conflict. No single demonstration against the war in the past five years is as important as the action on October 16. Even the massive April 15 Mobilization was still an effort to petition to the goodwill and sanity of the government. But October 16 is no longer an appeal. It is a statement. It is a fact. October 16 creates a new dialogue between the hard fact of a criminal war and the equally hard fact of an absolute opposition to military service

The WRL has been involved with The Resistance, not as the initiator, but as one of those groups which was forced into a creative response by the decisions taken by these men on their own. Roy Kepler flew to New York to help build support for The Resistance on the part of those past draft age. In New York WRL has given free office space to The Resistance. But none of this is enough—it is the least these men have a right to expect from us.

The west coast has worked particularly closely with The Resistance and has taken one of its organizers, Dave Harris, on its staff. Bob Meriwether, our San Francisco office manager, reports: "On October 16, while draft-eligible men are turning in ther draft cards, supporting demonstrators will sit down in the doorways of the Oakland induction center in waves of 20. The Civil Action Day Committee, sponsor of this demonstration, has conducted three sitdowns this summer at the induction center which resulted in a total of 38 arrests. The committee is headquartered in the WRL office."

From Los Angeles, Paul Encimer reports: "Draft resistance is the focus of WRL activity here at this time. We have been a part of the anti-draft coalition which maintains counselors and which conducts daily leaflet distributions at the induction center and at local draft boards. WRL's weekly nonviolence study group has become a planning committee for the week of anti-draft activities which will start October 16."

Let us recognize that October 16 is what we have been waiting for—open, nonviolent, direct resistance to the war. October 16 takes the peace movement beyond dissent to resistance. As Dave Miller's original draft-card burning opened a new phase in peace activity, leading to Octber 16, so October 16 will open a new phase. It is not the "first and last" mass disobedience. It is, instead, the beginning of a period when, all else having failed, civil disobedience must be more widely used and more politically organized, involving both pacifists and nonpacifists. Our Chairman, Edward Gottlieb, urged this course in the last issue of WRL News.

For information on the October 16th Resistance contact the following:

New York City:	WRL, 5 Beekman St., phone CO 7-4592 Fred Rosen, Resistance, 5 Beekman St., phone RE 2-4272
Iowa:	Fred Barnett, 219 E. Bloomington, Iowa City, phone 338-6185
Chicago:	Paul O'Brian, Resistance-CADRE, 333 W. North Ave., phone 664-6895
Oregon:	Portland WRL, 52 N.W. Macleay, Portland, phone 222-4642 Ken Swanson, 11 SE Tenth, Portland, phone 234-1309 Bill Vandercook, Reed College, Portland Carlton Olsen, 502 N. 5th, Corvallis, phone 753-3782
California:	Los Angeles WRL, 1046 N. Sweetzer, phone OL 4-4491 Monterey WRL, 365 Spruce, Pacific Grove, phone 375-7750 WRL West, 514 Mission St., San Francisco, phone 391-2868 Lennie Heller, The Resistance, 2502 Telegraph, Berkeley, phone 849-4950 David Harris, Peace and Liberation Commune, 2269 Cooley Ave., East Palo Alto, phone 323-0529 Brian King, 581 S. 12 St., San Jose, phone 287-6098
Georgia:	Atlanta Workshop in Nonviolence, Box 7477, 1044 Piedmont Ave. NE, phone 872-1137

THE MIDDLE EAST V

by Irwin Stark

Having been a resident of Jerusalem—I was a visiting lecturer at the Hebrew University—before, during and for more than a month after the Middle East war of June 5-11, I speak from a personal knowledge of events and with a degree of sympathy for the State of Israel. At the same time, however, although I am a Jew, I have always opposed the nationalistic inspiration of political Zionism which I still find incompatible with my socialist-pacfist orientation. So much by way of defining my private bias.

Nevertheless, it seems to me that short of stepping outside history—a rather difficult feat when you occupy a bomb-shelter with women and children threatened with annihilation and when shells are falling all around you—the pacifist is forced to make a moral choice if such a choice is at all possible within the limits of a particular situation. Should the contingency have arisen, I would have been prepared to defend my wife, my friends and my neighbors against death at the hands of Jordanians, Egyptians or Syrians just as I hope I would have been prepared to do the same if we had occupied a shelter in Cairo, Damascus or Amman. I faced and made this choice during the twenty-four hours when the fate of Jerusalem and of Israel had not yet been decided.

Cannot Be Neutralist

Aside from this private choice, it also seems to me that, given the circumstances which immediately preceded the outbreak of hostilities, I could not in all good conscience have taken a strictly neutralist position. The scores of armed incursions into the territory of Israel, the shelling of Israeli settlements from the Syrian highlands, Nasser's expulsion of UNEF from the Gaza border, the massing of Egyptian troops in the Sinai and the blockading of the Gulf of Aqaba could not but lead to such Israeli responses as the Samua Raid into Jordan, the shooting down of six Syrian MIG's and the full-scale war of June 5-11. Living within the ominous shadow of an Arab propaganda machine which openly spoke of the imperative task of "wiping out the Palestinian Jews and their supporters—the scum of Tel Aviv, New York and Hollywood," and which urged the faithful to "Kill them, crush them, suck their blood," Israel acted with a restraint that in my judgment was truly remarkable. From Tuesday, May 16, when Egyptian troops began to pour into the Sinai, until Monday, June 5, when Israeli planes destroyed the Egyptian air arm—a period of almost three weeks—Israel waited, however impatiently and distrustfully, for UN or Big Power intervention. (The myth of an incipient Israel invasion of Syria—as substantial as the myth of Anglo-American air support—was exploded several days before the war when the Soviet Ambassador declined Prime Minister Eshkol's invitation to inspect the region either in person or through other Soviet personnel.) But at no time before, during or after the war was I aware of arrogance, chauvinism or hatred of the Arab. On the oontrary, the lack of jubiliation after the victory was matched only by the melancholy sense of tragic inevitabiilty which our numerous Israeli friends felt and manifested in the weeks prior to the actual conflict.

National Survival At Stake

This is not to say that as a pacifist I approved of the Israeli responses to Arab provocation. But if one accepts the present reality of the State of Israel, a sovereign nation among other sovereign nations, I fail to see how it could have survived except by taking the action it was eventually forced to take. Israel is a democratic state, probably the most democratic in the Middle East, with an economy that is a peculiar mixture of socialism and capitalism—but it is not, obviously, a pacifist state. One could wish that in its relationships with its neigbhors it might act without recourse to its military power. But wishing won't make it so—not while it must deal with the reality of Arab states armed to the teeth by the super-powers and their allies, not while like its neighbors it must become involved with and be subject to the pressures generated in large measure by the Soviet-American confrontation.

It is fruitless, I think, to argue about the original creation of a Jewish state in the Middle East—as if history could be neatly rearranged, if not prearranged, to satisfy the noblest criteria of an immaculate Justice. Israel exists. It is a fact that cannot be blinked. And the sooner the Arab world awakes from the fantasy of believing that Israel is merely an eidolon made of wind and sand by a capitalist-imperialist coalition (which, incidentally, included Russia), the sooner will peace and material well-being replace the intolerable burden of tension which marks Middle Eastern life today. This will not happen automatically or overnight. But it is the crux of one of the major problems which remain to be solved.

To a very large extent such a consummation depends upon Russia and the United States. If the billions of dollars and rubles which have gone into stoking the tensions of the area could be devoted to the vast constructive projects so badly needed by all the peoples of the Middle East, there is no problem—the refugee problem, the problem of Israel's own Arab population, of water and land resources, etc.—that would not be amenable to rational solution.

The Pacifist Role

Here is where the pacifist role can prove of incalculable value. I do not mean to be simplistic—the conflicts *are* incredibly complex and had I the space I should have been glad to discuss them at length. But in the final analysis the question is the old question of war—hot, cold or luke-warm. Raising the living standards of the Arab masses may not prevent war from breaking out but it is one of the significant goals toward which pacifism can profitably direct their energies. In this respect Vietnam and the Middle East are essentially the same question. To pretend to be neutral where the issues, no matter how ambiguous they may prove when examined in depth, offer an opportunity for a moral choice—as I am persuaded they do in the Middle East as well as in Vietnam—is to end by being simply neutre. In both cases, however, the overriding issue is peace.

WAR – TWO VIEWS

by Igal Roodenko

The facts Irwin Stark presents I believe to be true. But I believe that there are additional facts to consider, that his perspective is different from mine, and that we therefore differ in conclusions.

To contrast extremist Arab views with pacific Israeli views is clearly one-sided. True, governmental statements from Jerusalem are much more peaceful than those from Cairo and the other Arab capitals. But there is more to politics than words: few people can make a better peace speech than Johnson, and the words from Hanoi are less peaceful than those from Washington. I am not saying that the political situations are in any way comparable, but that judging a conflict mainly by the words of the parties can be tragically misleading.

If the Arabs are the aggrieved peoples, then the violence of their speech becomes more forgivable—just as we can and do forgive much of American blacks' talk of violence and find hypocritical and repugnant whites' talk of law and order, of patience and conciliation.

Politics versus Morality

What then are the facts behind the words? A small, dispersed and persecuted people lay claim to a specific territory because of historical and religious reasons. The earlier possessors lay claim that they, too, have historical and religious reasons. But moral reasons count for little in politics —particularly international politics. Who would take seriously — politically — the claims of American Indians or Black Nationalists, or European Gypsies? And if Jews have legitimate claims because of possession 2000 years ago, how can Israel ignore the claims of present Arab refugees who themselves—and their fathers and grandfathers—have lived in these very lands?

Truly, the problem seems hopelessly complex. But a pacifist view, I believe, would point to universally held and respected —and violated—ideals: that all political boundaries are evil, that every human being should have the right to settle where he will, that all restrictions on travel—across boundaries and through waterways—are to be rejected.

Some partisans of Israel—or of the Arabs—would say that these are beautiful ideals, but how do they apply when the "enemy" is invading, or threatening to invade? This appeal, probably older than human speech, no matter how morally worded, is in essence blackmail. It denies that cause and effect operate in human affairs just as certainly as in the chemist's testtube. Was there any politically astute Israeli who did not know that after two wars in twenty years, a third war with the Arabs was almost certain to follow? To claim that Israel had been doing everything possible to achieve peace with the Arabs may be true. I doubt it. But assuming its truth, good intentions are not enough. There is little sentiment in politics, which is concerned exclusively with results. And the political result is that Israel has not succeeded in achieving some form of peaceful coexistence with the Arab world.

The Individual's Role

To place blame for the war on the double-dealing role of the Soviet Union strikes me as naive. There is no morality in government, anywhere—right, left or center. A government's sole business is to maintain and increase its power. Toward this end it will make and break commitments, prepare for and engage in warfare, and use the most beguiling lies to justify itself. For any political leader to accept at its face value the "solemn" assurances of another power, is to prove his ineptness at his job. And to blame the big powers for doubledealing in the Middle East is, while true, letting both Israel and the Arab states off too lightly. It is your job and my job to make peace—not the job of someone else's big brother.

What an individual does when personally confronted by violence is another matter and to a degree, outside the province of organized political pacifism. I can only state what I would hope I would be strong enough to do in a particular situation. I would no more sit in judgment on Stark resorting to violence in order to protect his life and that of his family, than I would in the least be critical of the South African black, the Vietnamese peasant or the Jew in the Warsaw ghetto. But to equate an act of personal desperation with premeditated preparations for mass slaughter—the business of every state, large and small—is the kind of sentimental thinking which has led all well-meaning peace people into the arms of the militarists since the beginning of time.

I did not intend a defense of the Arabs. I condemn them as I condemn all those who use and who plan to use violence whatsoever the provocation. If I appear more critical of Israel than of the Arabs, it is because of Stark's partial justification of the Israelis, and because of the widespread support in America for Israel. If I am correct in saying that Israel failed to face reality these past twenty years, Stark is no less correct in saying that the Arabs fail to face the reality of the existence of Israel. But the conclusion is not that one is more realistic or moral than the other, but that both have failed and are failing.

The Pacifist Conclusion

And the pacifist conclusion is that—as always, everywhere—the fat cats posture and intrigue while the sheep are slaughtered. And cheer their own slaughter. Everywhere and always.

The pacifist conclusion—this pacifist's conclusion—is that if life is ever to be taken, let me make that decision and let me be responsible for it. Let me never give a government the assurance that it can count on my support no matter how badly it fails. To accept conscription is one way of giving the powerful this kind of blank check. Another way is by accepting the facile division of nations—and classes and religions—into good guys and bad guys, and the division of aggressions into the justified and the diabolic.

Of course, we are sophisticated about politics as well as being moralists. But the most sophisticated politics today holds that violence is the enemy. Everytime we yield to special pleas and forget the truth, we welcome world war III.

Nonviolence and the New Politics Convention

by Edward Gottlieb

At the recent New Politics Convention in Chicago, someone had to stand up against the mood of violence released by the Black Caucus even though this group had turned itselves into an intimidating mob. I was proud of the pacifists attending. Many wore their pins, not thinking it necessary to sacrifice their own dignity as a prerequisite to giving recognition to the black man.

The Workshop on Nonviolence

Early Thursday afternoon I posted a call for a WRL Workshop on Nonviolence and registered my request for a room with Bruce Smith, staff member and a WRL worker in the south for the past two years.

This was merely a matter of good pacifist routine. However, once the Black Caucus had sent in its dictatorial and demeaning ultimatum to a Convention, whose broad-based democratic process it was boycotting completely, it became imperative for WRL to rally as many delegates as possible against this rising tide of violence. Many of us had held our breath during the mass meeting the night before when a group at the rear of the hall did all they could to disrupt the speech of Martin Luther King.

By Friday evening we had distributed to the press and delegates an "Address for a Nonviolent Caucus" in which we tried to point out that a program of autonomy and self-direction in the ghetto, which might well embrace direct action and civil disobedience, would be much more productive than the bombast of violent talk in a setting of social and cultural vacuum.

On Sunday afternoon we held our four-hour session in which more than 50 delegates participated, though at that same time a plenary session of the convention was unexpectedly called to hear Rap Brown and James Forman. Brown would speak only to the Black Caucus. Toward the end of our workshop we adopted a three-point resolution which we distributed the next morning to the convention and to the press.

We protested first of all the tone and spirit of the Black Caucus demonstration and the abject surrender of the convention to its mood of violence. This amounted to passive subjection so common to those who disdain to consider nonviolence. Our pacifist group further deplored the preclusion of any discussion that might explore alternatives to violence. Finally, we objected to the invitations to known advocates of violence to address the convention "without at the same time giving similar opportunities to those members of the radical community who have been working in areas of nonviolence with considerable success."

The Potentials

Aside from the various patterns of political action possible, including that of a presidential ticket or third party organization, there are many areas of direct action in schools, housing, and welfare that could be explored. One of the Black Caucus's points, which received the barest reference and which may well have been taken from King's speech the night before, did propose to transfer the control of ghetto life to the people who live there. One could see how the right of eminent domain and the jurisdiction of ghetto courts could transform the community. Where black people have been denied the benefits of the Constitution, direct action and civil disobedience are appropriate to establish independence and popular sovereignty. Unlike the explosions of riots or the proposed disruptions of economic flow, the direct intervention of Black Power in black communities could well bring a new creative order. What we have now is a breakdown of human interaction; a canyon gap in human integration, and a wall between human communication. The white power structure has practically abdicated its responsibilities and only Black Power can now supply the vocabulary of motivation and the ritual of solidarity that will enable the ghetto to "do it yourself."

Had the Black Power people organized themselves around such a program of independence and autonomy, their goals would have been accepted readily by the convention and work would have gone forward to construct the political, social, economic, and cultural framework for the program. Those who came to New Politics had already gotten to understand the difference between separation and segregation. White America had in effect long ago decreed that there were to be two nations and the convention might properly have extended diplomatic relations to the black community in the planning and preparation. The deliberations could have been bi-cameral with the final decision process around the negotiating table. Meanwhile, sessions of the workshops and commissions could have gone on with maximum participation of both groups so that the ultimate decision-making bodies could have had common grounds. In reality, the few workshops that succeeded in being held with some black participation were very productive. In the brief one on the schools there were only three blacks in a large group yet their new image led to such creative suggestions that leadership settled very easily around them.

The Future

Unfortunately the Black Caucus moved in too quickly on the vacuum in our group relations. Because we were individually relating so well on a person-to-person level, we could not see that we already were partitioned into two nations.

From now on only separateness, self-determination, and self-realization could restore the dignity of racial integrity which alone could move the black man into a new creative potential, spiritually, culturally, intellectually. This, as I see it, is the true program of Black Power, the power of blackness, the spiritual quality inherent in negritude. Before this program could be placed properly upon the table, however, the Black Caucus moved in with its own mystique of manhood, "spit on whitey," and me-first.

If New Politics is to go forward it evidently will have to do so in two sections. Until the black man establishes his political identity, we will have to have this interim stage of separateness. Perhaps in the negotiations between white radicals and Black Power a new American coalition will be worked out which ultimately, through the widest participation on the local community level, will create the new American image, not white, nor black but human.

The south's first major peace parade took place in Atlanta on Hiroshima Day under sponsorship of the Atlanta Alliance for Peace, a coalition of peace, civil rights and community organizations including the Atlanta Workshop in Nonviolence.

NONviolent Protest Is Still the Most Effective

by Jim Peck

During the decade in which Bayard Rustin headed WRL—1954-64—the League addressed itself to nonviolence on the racial scene as well as on the war scene. In those days—except for Robert Williams, who fled to Cuba and then to China, nobody in the civil rights movement advocated violence and nobody in the ghettos engaged in it as a form of rebellion.

The "long hot summers" had not yet started. The first was 1964 and that same year there emerged in the south a civil rights organization committed to violence, the Deacons for Defense & Justice.

In his final article for WRL NEWS (July-August 1964) entitled "The Harlem Riot & Nonviolence," Rustin wrote regarding his role: "Perhaps the most important lesson I learned from this experience is that nonviolence is relevant to a degree—even when fear, brutality and violence rage." The article concluded: "Reliving those four nights of terror and ugliness, I become more dedicated to nonviolence, for I see clearly how resort to violence dehumanizes all who are caught up in its whirlpool."

While concurring with this statement, I thoroughly disagree with Rustin's present policy of seeking coalitions so broad as to make direct action impossible. Neither the NAACP nor the Urban League will put their names to a statement urging nonviolent action in the streets and therefore, the civil rights leaders' joint statement which Rustin initiated, pertaining to the 1967 "riots" was meaningless. It was meaningless because it offered no alternative to the violent action which had erupted in 30 cities.

A Workable Alternative

Martin Luther King did offer an alternative, on August 15 when he told delegates to the Southern Christian Leadership Conference's convention: "mass civil disobedience can use rage as a constructive and creative force. To dislocate the functioning of a city without destroying it can be more effective than a riot because it can be longer-lasting, costly to the society but not wantonly destructive. Moreover, it is more difficult for Government to quell it by superior force."

What supporters of violence fail to realize, is that the power structure inevitably can command "superior force." In a violent racial situation, the power structure first summons the local police. If they can't cope, it summons the state troopers, then the national guard and finally, if necessary, the Army. Thus, the status quo is frozen and remains so even after calm is restored. Possibly a little additional anti-poverty money is allotted, but the basic sores of segregation remain.

As specific examples of "nonviolent confrontation," King gave the convention delegates: blocking plant gates with unemployed blacks, disrupting governmental operations with sit-ins and weekly school boycotts.

Whether King could mobilize a major nonviolent protest action in light of the present decline in popularity of nonviolence, is questionable. He did last summer in Chicago, his brother did this spring in Louisville, and Father James Groppi is doing so in Milwaukee. I feel King definitely could do it, at least in one key locality.

Nonviolence Has Proved Itself

This would demonstrate that nonviolent action, even though it is out-of-style, is still the most effective method for blacks, and for any oppressed people to win their rights. In the latter 1930's, mass production workers won their objectives by joining the CIO, negotiating, striking, picketing, sitting down in the factories. In the early 1960s blacks, joined with sympathetic whites, won their objectives by joining CORE and SNCC, negotiating, picketing, sitting-in, freedom riding, marching.

The 1960 lunch counter sit-ins won the abolition of segregation in eating places. The 1961 Freedom Rides ended segregation in southern travel. The 1963 March on Washington, climaxing two and a half years of widespread nonviolent action, won passage of the first meaningful U.S. civil rights law. The 1965 Selma campaign culminating with the Montgomery March brought enactment of the U.S. voting rights law. King's Chicago marches last summer won a concrete agreement, which while it might have been stronger and while it has not been sufficiently implemented, succeeded in making the entire local real estate power structure act for the first time against housing discrimination.

Since 1964, advocacy of violence—and of black racism—have become fashionable in The Movement, even though they have failed to win any concrete gains such as had been won through nonviolence in the first half of the decade. H. Rap Brown fancies himself a radical when he harrangues ghetto inhabitants with "get yourself some guns," "burn," "kill." Many young whites — including pacifists — fancy themselves radical by condoning, if not supporting, the present trend. They are oblivious of the fact that both violence and racism are not radical at all, but are in effect the reactionary practices of the power structure. And they forget that good ends cannot be attained through evil means.